



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	McKinleyville Community Services District	County	Humboldt
		Grant Request	\$ 101,300.00
Project Title	Groundwater Management Plan Development and Data Gaps Evaluation	Total Project Cost	\$ 116,976.00

Project Description: The MCSD proposal develops a groundwater study and management plan to improve understanding of the local hydrologic and geologic conditions, creates an Integrated Regional Groundwater Management Plan, and plans for sustainability of groundwater as a local water resource for the project area.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	3
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	2
Work Plan	4
Budget	1
Schedule	2
QA/QC	4
Past Performance	1
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	17

- **GWMP or Program:** Applicant seeks funding to prepare a Groundwater Management Plan (GWMP). The plan is scheduled for adoption within 20 months of the award date. Resolution to apply for grant also indicates the group's intention to prepare and adopt a GWMP; however, it was in Attachment 1 and not clearly indicated in Attachment 3.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete. The project description is not clear enough to relate each of the four parts of the project provided. Also, it is not clear what components are going to be included in the GWMP. The proposal does not mention the SB 1938 requirements, or the upcoming required recharge mapping.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. The work plan is lacking tasks associated with the proposed work. Work descriptions are high level and as a result it is missing many critical details that are necessary to determine if scope of work, schedule and budgets are valid. The work plan is not aligned with the budget and the schedule.
- **Budget:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. Applicant has not identified the breakdown of cost share versus grant share. The budget doesn't coincide with the work plan or the schedule. No assumptions or source of funding are identified. It's unclear how the various attachment budget breakdowns are associated with project.
- **Schedule:** The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is insufficient. The schedule doesn't agree with the work plan and the budget. Grant administration and project management tasks are not identified. The rationale on how the schedule was developed is not presented in the write up.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed but not thoroughly documented. A qualified staff member will oversee the collection of hydrogeologic test results, as well as the GWMP will be circulated among committees, public agencies and community members. Applicant has generalized the QA/QC which will take place and doesn't provide specific standards and objectives for the QA/QC process. For example the equipment will be calibrated; however, there is no mention of how or what standards will be used for the calibration.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Past Performance:** The criterion is minimally addressed and not thoroughly documented. The project references provided are not recent or comparable to this application. And even though the grant experience is not related to a groundwater project, no supporting details are provided in regards to how the agency performed with schedule and budget management.